

checks. They know this policy will help keep guns out of the hands of criminals.

The current system has already stopped 3 million gun sales to convicted felons and others who are prohibited by law from owning a firearm, but we can and must do more.

The good news is that, a year ago this month, the new majority in the Congress took up two bills to establish universal background checks, including H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act. Sadly, the Senate refuses to take up these bills, and with every day that passes, 96 Americans are killed by guns.

Today, we remember the over 100,000 survivors who have been injured by guns and are every day, those that we have lost, and the countless other Americans who are affected by gun violence in our country. We should never rest until Congress takes every action to address this.

DON'T BE FOOLED

(Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Madam Speaker, the new Medicaid proposal from the White House is a reverse Robin Hood on steroids, a coordinated effort to steal from the poor and give to the rich campaign donors at Mar-a-Lago and other places.

This White House has put Medicaid on the chopping block, Medicaid, the program specifically put in place to provide healthcare to our most vulnerable citizens, our seniors, our veterans, the working poor, and their children.

My Republican colleagues will tell you, no, this is merely about giving States greater flexibility. That is nonsense. Federal law already gives States flexibility. This is about taking away healthcare to pay for their tax cuts.

This is the latest in the GOP's long war on the working people and the poor people of this country. They have cut the Children's Health Insurance Program. They have cut food stamps. And now they are cutting Medicaid.

Don't be fooled. This has long been in their plan.

GUN VIOLENCE CONTINUES TO BRING AGONY TO COMMUNITIES AND FAMILIES

(Mr. VARGAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VARGAS. Madam Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I rise today in support of National Gun Violence Survivors Week.

Every year, over 36,000 Americans are killed in acts of gun violence, and almost 100,000 more are shot and injured. This includes nearly 3,000 children and teens who are shot and killed and nearly 15,600 who are shot and injured.

Firearms are the second leading cause of death for children and teens and the first leading cause of death for African American children and teens in the U.S.

Gun violence overly affects people of color. African Americans represent most gun homicide victims and are 10 times more likely than White Americans to die from gun violence.

Gun violence continues to bring agony every day to communities and families around the country. While we cannot bring back the many loved ones lost to gun violence, we must act to prevent more casualties. It is past time for the Senate to act to save American lives.

□ 1230

RECOGNIZING GUN VIOLENCE SURVIVORS WEEK

(Mr. MOULTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOULTON. Madam Speaker, 2 years ago, I was standing at a rally where the father of a gunshot victim, a father who lost his son to gun violence, spoke of all the things that he and others are doing to stop this senseless scourge, things that they are already doing.

But then he turned to the crowd, and he said, "But what is Congress doing?" And tens of thousands of people, as if they had rehearsed it a hundred times, all said, together, "Nothing."

"But what is Congress doing?"
"Nothing."

Madam Speaker, for too long, Congress has done nothing. We have passed bills here in the House that take the right steps, but this alone is not enough. The Senate needs to do their job, and we need to make them law. Thoughts and prayers won't cut it, only action saves lives.

ADMINISTRATION'S LACK OF DIVERSITY IN ITS ACTIONS

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I am concerned about the lack of diversity, the lack of care about diversity that this administration shows in its appointments and its actions.

In the Federal judiciary, the President has appointed approximately 250 judges, 6 of whom are African American. That is a disturbing and chilling number.

In a Super Bowl ad, he showed Alice Marie Johnson, whom he gave executive clemency to, a commutation, and said he was trying to help people who looked like her, an African American woman.

He has given two executive clemencies to African Americans. One was Jack Johnson, posthumous, dead for 80

years. Only one living African American has gotten a commutation, and that was when Kim Kardashian championed her case, as Sylvester Stallone championed that of Jack Johnson.

During his speech, he talked about the Tuskegee Airman, the woman who he said would get a scholarship, the young girl. The fact is he just appointed a TVA Board, Tennessee Valley Board, nine members—no African Americans, one woman.

The lack of diversity is chilling. America is diverse. It is our strength. We need to embrace it and not have an all White world.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.RES. 826, EXPRESSING DISAPPROVAL OF THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION'S HARMFUL ACTIONS TOWARDS MEDICAID; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2474, PROTECTING THE RIGHT TO ORGANIZE ACT OF 2019; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5687, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER RELIEF AND PUERTO RICO DISASTER TAX RELIEF ACT, 2020

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 833 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 833

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 826) expressing disapproval of the Trump administration's harmful actions towards Medicaid. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2474) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for

the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5687) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. Clause 2(e) of rule XXI shall not apply during consideration of the bill. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 833, providing for consideration of three measures: H. Res. 826, Expressing Disapproval of the Trump Administration's Harmful Actions Towards Medicaid; H.R. 5687, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief and Puerto Rico Disaster Tax Relief Act; and, finally, H.R. 2474, the Protecting the Right to Organize Act.

The rule provides for H. Res. 826 to be considered under a closed rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The rule further provides for consideration of H.R. 2474 under a structured rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. The rule self-executes the manager's amendment from Chairman SCOTT making in order 16 amendments and provides one motion to recommit.

Finally, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 5687 under a structured rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule makes in order six amendments and provides one motion to recommit.

Madam Speaker, before us today, we have three measures that all speak to one very, very important topic in America today. That topic is inequality.

Madam Speaker, Justice Louis Brandeis once famously said: In this country, we can either have democracy or we can have the concentration of wealth in the hands of very few, but we can't have both.

Unfortunately, right now in this country, we are at historic levels of inequality. A handful of families control more wealth than the bottom 50 percent of Americans—160 million Americans. Forty percent of lower income Americans make \$30,000 a year. The top 1 percent in income—not wealth, but in income—earn over \$7 million a year, while the other 99 percent earn on an average of \$54,000 a year.

We cannot have this level of inequality.

President Abraham Lincoln famously said that labor and capital must always be balanced in America to have democracy. And he said:

If capital ever had the control over labor, democracy would cease to exist.

From the pearls of wisdom of people like Lincoln and Brandeis, we are warned again today that we have to

have countervailing institutions, as John Galbraith said, between labor and capital. This is in the best interests of everyone, including those who are making and reaping exorbitant benefits from the current inequality.

But most importantly—most importantly—as Brandeis said, you cannot have democracy with the current situation of inequality.

Not only is this inequality wrong, but its consequences in our everyday lives, like worse health outcomes, diseases of depression, behavioral health impacts, and economic insecurity, these public health instances are directly correlated to income inequality as demonstrated by the landmark work, "The Spirit Level," 10 years ago.

The first resolution that is part of this rule expresses strong disapproval of the Trump administration's recent attempt to turn Medicaid into a block grant.

Medicaid is our Nation's promise to a group left behind by rampant inequality that will help provide basic services to protect their health and well-being—basic services. The Trump administration proposal doubles down on its cruel policies that put cost savings over life savings.

The second bill provides disaster relief to Puerto Rico. This is a community that has been devastated repeatedly by disasters, exposing the inequality not only in Puerto Rico, but between this administration's treatment of a territory versus a State. Puerto Rico needs our help. Without it, roads will remain unpassable, schools will remain closed, and the poor will become poorer.

And, finally, we have the Protecting the Right to Organize, the PRO Act. President Eisenhower once said that only a fool would attempt to block a working man or woman, an American worker, from joining a labor union. President Eisenhower said this, a Republican President, much admired.

This was at a time where America had the largest expansion in our history, and the world's expansion, growing at over 6 percent of GDP a year that everybody benefited from. One year was 13 percent. At that time, one in three American workers were in a labor union.

By the time Ronald Reagan became President, one in four Americans was in a labor union. By the time President Reagan left office, 1 in 10 American workers were in a labor union.

The balance between labor and capital is the essence of American democracy. It is unbalanced and risks our democracy at this moment.

The ability for American workers to organize and have a voice in the outcomes, not just of their work, but of their retirement and the benefit to their families and communities, has been attacked since President Reagan was in office.

□ 1245

Evidence is clear that the rise in inequality has coincided with the decline

in union membership. By most estimates, declining unionization accounted for about a third of the increase in inequality of which I speak in the 1980s and 1990s.

To address inequality, you have to include working people. You have to include the right to organize. Labor unions are universally recognized as providing major boosts to employees' wages and benefits. Sadly, the best evidence we have on this trend is by comparing union States like the one I am proud to represent, California, to right-to-work States.

In 1979, States with historically high levels of union membership, like in the Northeast and the Rust Belt, saw relatively low rates of income inequality. Just the opposite held true for right-to-work States. If you watched data over the years since the 1970s as States move as a group toward less union coverage, those same States have much worse inequality and poor performing GDP.

Unions not only raise wages for workers they represent, but they also have been shown to moderate compensation for executives. On top of all the obvious benefits you think of that are associated with labor unions like higher wages and safer workplaces, some of the others that come along with union membership also help address the inequities in our society.

Union workers are more likely to receive paid leave, are up to 28 percent more likely to have employer-sponsored health insurance and are up to 54 percent more likely to be enrolled in employer-sponsored pensions.

Not only do workers have better access to pensions, but their employers contribute an average of 28 percent more toward those pensions than non-union employers.

The PRO Act simply updates labor laws, labor laws that have been attacked for 30 years, to ensure that workers in today's economy are able to create and join labor unions to receive the same kinds of protections they see in other sectors. Nothing more.

Madam Speaker, I suspect we will hear a lot of misinformation—especially about the PRO Act—from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Make no mistake about it, Madam Speaker, these three bills will help restore power to the people, which the administration repeatedly has tried to strip power from.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, today's rule provides for consideration of three unrelated measure, each of which have little chance of passing the Senate or becoming law. The one is a nonbinding messaging resolution, another one a partisan labor bill, and the third provides billions of dollars in Federal aid

for disaster recovery from recent earthquakes in Puerto Rico, but actually can be distributed to meet unmet needs in other States.

Let's talk first about the resolution expressing disapproval for the Trump administration's Healthy Adult Opportunity demonstration project that was just announced on January 30.

A letter provided by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services to State Medicaid directors detailed an option for States to apply for increased flexibility under the section 1115 for Medicaid waivers.

The Healthy Adult Opportunity demonstration provides States with a choice as to how they would like to receive their funding for adults under the age of 65 who are covered by a Medicaid expansion population.

This does not include children. This does not include pregnant women. It does not include individuals with disabilities, or the elderly.

This only applies to healthy adults who are not covered as part of the traditional Affordable Care Act population, and if, and only if, the States decide to pursue the Healthy Adult Opportunity.

H. Res. 862 is a political statement made to diminish the efforts of the Trump administration. It is unreasonable and unrealistic for Democrats to declare this demonstration an attack on Medicaid after only a few days since the release of the plan.

Do we have a full understanding of the opportunity grants? So I strongly suggest Members on both sides of the aisle speak with their Governors and their counterparts in State legislatures to ask about this option.

My office did indeed speak with our Texas Governor this week. The State is still unpacking everything that the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services may provide, and this may not be an option Texas will take, but it is up to them. They are currently running internal analyses to come to a conclusion, a process that does take some time.

Recognizing this, there is little chance that the Senate will agree to this messaging resolution. A far better approach would have been for us to have, perhaps, a hearing and a markup in our committee of jurisdiction.

Unfortunately, not everyone agreed with that.

H.R. 2474, the PRO Act, has a similarly low chance of being considered by the Senate. The bill is nothing more than a requirement that workers become members of labor unions. Republicans support the right of employees to form a labor union, but it should be a choice for every individual worker.

There is a card-check system included in this bill. Employees will no longer enjoy the privacy of a secret ballot election. Organizers will be able to collect authorization cards covering 50 percent of the bargaining unit and form a union without holding a secret election.

In effect, employees are not protected from potential political intimidation and not protected from coercive behavior by organizers in an effort to obtain the required number of cards.

That is not free and voluntary choice.

Against a recent National Labor Relations Board decision, the bill reinstates what are called micro unions, allowing bargaining units smaller than a workplace if there is a community of interest.

The joint employer standard is expanded, creating liability for franchise owners, franchise owners who may have no direct relationship with the franchisee employee. This is not only unreasonable, it is impractical, and certainly will weaken or damage the franchise model of business.

In addition, the bill preempts State right-to-work laws. My State is a right-to-work State. Does the Federal Government know Texas citizens better than the State of Texas? This disregards the rights of 27 States by overturning their right-to-work laws.

Even more concerning, employers will be required to provide union organizers with an employee's personal information without the employee's consent.

In the Energy and Commerce Committee we are in the middle of negotiating both sides: What are the parameters, or what should be the parameters of a Federal privacy law? This provision in this bill flies in the face of protecting individuals' privacy, and it is odd because in the committee, the other side seemed so eager to defend privacy in any other forum.

Along with these partisan measures, we are also considering emergency disaster funding for Puerto Rico. The supplemental appropriation provides over \$4 billion for cyber and energy security, electricity restoration, education assistance, the Federal Highway Administration, and the Community Development Block Grant.

In recent years, Puerto Rico has faced multiple natural disasters, including Hurricanes Irma and Maria in 2017, and a series of earthquakes in January of this year. There is no doubt that Puerto Rico is facing a long road to recovery, but compounding the national disasters is a mismanagement of aid.

Just a couple of weeks ago, a warehouse was discovered full of emergency supplies. Some of them had been there since 2017. Citizens were outraged. They broke into the warehouse and took it upon themselves to distribute the aid.

President Trump released nearly \$16 billion in aid funding in January but did place restrictions on usage to help prevent any squandering of Federal resources. This bill provides additional billions in aid without any accountability measures. Existing disaster aid should be expended before appropriating billions of taxpayer dollars. And then here is the kicker: It may not go towards its intended recipients.

Only a small portion of these funds are specifically directed to Puerto Rico. The rest may be applied to unmet needs of disasters in recent years. Yes, including Puerto Rico, but including many other States.

FEMA has yet to complete its damage assessment, and initial assessments indicate \$40 million in Federal costs, a much smaller amount than appropriated in this bill.

No one wants to deny any Americans support when they are in need, but this appropriation is premature. We could and should take the time to evaluate the best path for recovery for Puerto Rico, and we have the ability because there is existing disaster aid that has been released to meet those immediate needs.

Madam Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, just a couple of points to my friend from Texas' comments.

I include in the RECORD a February 2 Washington Post article entitled: "You'd think Trump would stop threatening insurance coverage by now. Think again."

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 2, 2020]

YOU'D THINK TRUMP WOULD STOP THREATENING INSURANCE COVERAGE BY NOW. THINK AGAIN.

(By the Washington Post Editorial Board)

Notwithstanding the progress under Obamacare, the United States still does not provide health insurance to all of its population. About 27.5 million people, or 8.5 percent of the population, lacked coverage throughout 2018, according to the most recent Census Bureau report published in September. The country has moved in the wrong direction since President Trump took office: The 2018 uninsured numbers were up over 2017.

You might think, given this history, that the Trump administration would cease proposing policy that threatens coverage; well, think again.

Mr. Trump's Department of Health and Human Services has unveiled a proposal that would allow states to receive federal Medicaid funding as a block grant, annually adjustable for inflation, while implementing cost-cutting measures such as work requirements, asset tests, co-payments and prescription drug limitations. (As a sweetener, states would be allowed to pocket some of the budgetary savings.) Existing rules essentially require states to provide a set of services to all those who meet federally established criteria, and fund them on an open-ended basis.

To be sure, the administration's proposal would not affect traditional Medicaid populations such as low-income pregnant women and people with disabilities. It targets only the so-called expansion population—the 17 million low-income adults who got Medicaid through Obamacare. And even then, it's unlikely it will be adopted in blue states with large Medicaid populations, such as California, or in red states that never expanded Medicaid in the first place and probably won't no matter how federal aid is structured, such as Texas.

Where it might make a difference is in red states that reluctantly expanded Medicaid

but are looking for ways scale it back, or in those 14 states that have not yet expanded but still want to do so in a limited way. An example of the latter category is Oklahoma, which is having a referendum on Medicaid expansion in November. That state's Republican Gov. Kevin Stitt, who opposes the referendum, jumped at the administration's offer. The proposal invokes—probably incorrectly—HHS's statutory authority to adjust Medicaid's core requirements, so its ultimate fate may depend on the courts. A federal judge in Washington blocked previous attempts by the agency to let New Hampshire, Kentucky and Arkansas set work requirements for Medicaid, which cost 18,000 people in the latter state their coverage, though the administration has appealed. (Kentucky has withdrawn its work requirements, which never took effect.)

Whatever its short-term practical impact, the administration's latest block-grant proposal could be significant in the long run. The ultimate goal is to legitimize block-granting and the coverage reductions the approach almost certainly entails. Reduced coverage, it should be mentioned, was partly why Congress previously, and repeatedly, rejected Republican plans to block-grant Medicaid. The United States badly needs a system of universal coverage that delivers services more efficiently than the existing hodgepodge. In its determination to chip away at Obamacare's compromise solution—Medicaid expansion—the Trump administration has revealed that it has other priorities.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, on the Medicaid block grants, I would just say, from my experience, as someone who was very involved in the adoption of the ACA in the California State Senate, both chairing the committee of jurisdiction and being involved in what we look back on as a very successful rollout, doing the block grants sets the threshold lower than is necessary. Remember that the Federal thresholds are only a base level. States can put more contributions from the State and local level in, which we have done in California. It has been successful at getting millions of Californians into insurance, as opposed to being in indigent care.

On the organizing aspect, this has come up in the Rules Committee, the secret ballot and privacy. A reminder, as Chairman SCOTT said last night: Secret ballot is still sacrosanct. It only comes up that it will not be if the National Labor Relations Board sanctions the employer for violating organizing rules.

Our research shows that 45 percent of employers threaten workers in meetings, threaten them if they are trying to organize. Seventy-five percent of employers hire consultants to run antiunion campaigns, and one in five employees who try to organize their fellow workers get fired or threatened with termination.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Mr. DESAULNIER for his leadership. I rise in very strong support of the PRO Act because it will restore the constitutional and civil rights of American citizens seeking to organize a union.

We have to remember that the right to organize is rooted in the First Amendment of the Constitution which protects the right of the people to speak, to assemble, and to petition for a redress of grievances.

All of these rights have been under severe attack over the last several decades of union busting and interference with the right of the people to organize into unions.

There are three specific provisions I want to mention that will restore the constitutional rights of the people to organize.

The first treats the violation of the right to organize like a violation of any other civil right in America. If your civil rights are violated based on race or based on gender, you have a right to go to court to sue for enforcement of your rights and for compensation for violation of those rights.

This PRO Act will give the same right to workers to go to court to enforce their labor organizing rights. Right now, they have got to go through the National Labor Relations Board which has been stifled with bureaucracy and red tape. And right now, under the PRO Act, if it passes, you will have the right to go to court as well as to go to the NLRB in order to enforce your right to organize.

□ 1300

Secondly, the PRO Act will end so-called captive audience speeches. Those are already illegal right now. Employers cannot herd all the workers into a big room and tell them why they have to vote for Donald Trump for President at the risk of perhaps earning the disfavor of the employer, being fired or demoted or whatever. But they can herd you into the room to tell you why unions are bad and why unions are a bad choice and predicting that the company will have to leave or lay off people if a union is voted in by the workers.

This ends captive audience speeches. The union doesn't have the right to herd all the workers into a room to propagandize them for the union; the employers should not have the right to herd all of them into a conference room to propagandize them against a union.

Finally, the PRO Act will restore the First Amendment rights of workers organizing a union or in a union to support boycotts, strikes, and other labor actions by workers in other places.

Amazingly, under the Taft-Hartley provisions and the way the labor law has grown up now, it is against the law for workers in a union to engage in secondary support and secondary boycotts and so on. This is a naked violation of the First Amendment rights of workers. Unionized workers should have every same right to support boycotts and strikes of their fellow workers as anyone else.

Madam Speaker, I do strongly support the PRO Act.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from

Kentucky (Mr. COMER), who is a valued member of the Education and Labor Committee.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I have heard from business owners throughout my district about the investments they are making in their businesses and hardworking employees thanks to the strong economy ushered in by President Trump. We have seen companies establish education programs, provide bonuses to their employees, and reinvest in their communities as a result of our booming economic climate. Unfortunately, the bill we are considering today would quickly erode this progress.

As was made clear during the Committee on Education and Labor hearing and subsequent markup, the PRO Act would not serve the interests of individual workers. By overriding States' choices to enact right-to-work laws meant to curtail forced unionization, codifying harmful rulemakings from the previous administration regarding the definition and classification of employees, and increasing the prevalence of worker intimidation and privacy infringement, the PRO Act is a maze of misguided and costly antiworker policies.

To correct one of the countless issues with this legislation, I submitted an amendment to strike the provisions that would legalize secondary boycotts. Unions should not be empowered to target and economically harm suppliers or business partners of a workplace they are seeking to organize.

Unfortunately, this and many other commonsense amendments were rejected by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle during markup and again at the Rules Committee yesterday.

Notably, the PRO Act federalizes California's ABC test limiting flexibility and opportunity for entrepreneurs in our modern economy and codifies the previous administration's joint employer standard that would disrupt and fatally damage the franchise model, harming thousands of small business owners across the Nation.

I recognize a business's greatest asset is its workers. For this reason, I am solidly proworker and probusiness and want to continue our strong economic growth while also protecting the freedoms of hardworking Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Kentucky an additional 1 minute.

Mr. COMER. Thankfully, this Democratic dream will meet a rude awakening in the Senate, where it will not see the light of day, and President Trump has signaled he would veto.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume before I introduce our next speaker.

I am a former small business owner who met a payroll for hundreds of people in the restaurant business in California. Our economy is the fifth largest economy in the world. There is lots of evidence showing that helping the employer and helping the consumer so they have more disposable income actually helps everyone.

As far as the dual employer rule, all we are doing is trying to protect what has been in effect for decades and not have it diminished, so there should be no impact on franchisees.

Lastly, the distinction I think that needs to be reiterated over and over again in light of the administration's assertions about the economy is, yes, the GDP is growing, not as large as the President had promised, but it is not being spread out.

As I mentioned in my opening comments, 50 percent—150 million, 160 million people—live on \$30,000 a year. They don't see the big benefit in what Wall Street gets. The average income is for the bottom 90 percent of Americans. It has increased just 1 percent from 1980 to 2017, while all their other costs have gone up, most notably healthcare and education. Average incomes, on the other hand, for the wealthiest 1 percent have increased by 184 percent.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise to speak in support of the Protecting the Right to Organize Act, or the PRO Act.

I am the daughter of a garment worker, so the fight for workers' rights has always had a special place in my heart. My mother toiled every day in the sweatshops in New Haven, Connecticut, sewing shirt collars and dresses. And she was a pieceworker, which meant she got pennies on the dollar. As chair of the Appropriations Committee's Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee, I work every day to ensure that her early struggles were not in vain.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the PRO Act introduced by the chair of the committee, Congressman BOBBY SCOTT. It strengthens the rights of working people to come together in union to secure better wages and better working conditions.

The single biggest economic challenge of our times is that people's pay doesn't keep up with their rising costs of healthcare, education, and childcare. From 1980 to 2017, average incomes for the bottom 90 percent of households stagnated to a 1.1 percent increase while skyrocketing more than 180 percent for the wealthiest 1 percent in this country. It is no coincidence that, at the same time, union membership fell to a record low of 10 percent.

Economists at Princeton found that the alarming rise of income inequality since the 1970s can be at least partially attributed to the decline in union membership.

The PRO Act is about leveling the playing field for working people. It penalizes predatory corporations that violate workers' rights and streamlines procedures at the National Labor Relations Board to more effectively deal with violations. It protects workers from being misclassified as independent contractors. It helps working people secure a winning agreement as part of a union. It protects union elections against interference. And it empowers unions and employers to negotiate agreements that collect fair share fees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Connecticut an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. DELAURO. It establishes a mediation and arbitration process to help ensure corporations and newly formed unions reach a first contract.

As Nobel-winning economist Joseph Stiglitz has said: Inequality is not inevitable. It is about the public policy choices we make.

Madam Speaker, it is not globalization, and it is not technology. We have the opportunity today to choose a public policy that, in fact, will defend and protect working people in this country.

Madam Speaker, pass the PRO Act.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately consider a resolution reinforcing policies that are part of the "best is yet to come" blueprint, which was outlined by President Trump in this very Chamber on Tuesday night in his historic and optimistic State of the Union Address.

His address highlighted the increase in wages for American workers, the decrease in unemployment, the reduction in the number of those receiving nutrition assistance, and the strength of our Armed Forces. He went on to detail the ongoing efforts to decrease healthcare costs and to improve access to broadband and the continuing defense of our borders, among other priorities.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGGLEMAN) to speak on his amendment.

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in an America with a booming economy, strong military, and optimistic future. On Tuesday, President Trump outlined

the “best is yet to come” blueprint during the State of the Union Address.

This agenda is an optimistic plan to continue the record-setting economic growth we are seeing and provide solutions to problems that all American citizens. It is imperative that Congress step forward and support this agenda as I do.

It is an agenda that dramatically lowers prescription drug prices and raises wages for hardworking Americans, an agenda that will build an inclusive society and make sure every young American has the opportunity to achieve the American Dream, and an agenda that will ensure every citizen can have access to high-speed internet, including in rural areas.

With a national unemployment rate of 3.5 percent and a Virginia unemployment rate of 2.6 percent, it is clear the economic policies the President has implemented are working. The “best is yet to come” blueprint will continue this growth and build upon it.

The American economy is stronger than ever, and we should work to continue this growth.

I have a district that is 10,000 square miles large, bigger than the State of New Jersey. Seeing the optimism and excitement in Virginia and Virginia's Fifth District is something to behold. We have built an inclusive economy where the least well-off are making some of the fastest gains and unemployment is at an all-time low.

There is no doubt that we are in the midst of a blue-collar boom in this country. Those who support the previous question are opposing the economic boom. That is why I will be voting against the previous question.

A vote against the previous question is a vote for lowering the number of impoverished Americans on food stamps. A vote against the previous question is a vote to continue the booming economic growth we have experienced. A vote against the previous question is a vote for enacting all these policies into law and furthering President Trump's agenda.

Madam Speaker, I urge defeat of the previous question so that we can consider my resolution and support the policies outlined in the “best is yet to come” policy blueprint.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from California for his leadership, especially in bringing before us the Protecting the Right to Organize Act of 2019.

Right now, in my home State, the Virginia General Assembly is engaged in a big debate about whether to repeal the right-to-work laws that have dominated our State for so many years, a repeal I have long supported.

That is why, today, I am proud to stand with my good friend and fellow Virginian, Chairman BOBBY SCOTT, in supporting this bill, the Protecting the Right to Organize Act.

Unions have been the backbone of a just and equitable economy. Their hard work gave us the 5-day workweek. Their hard work gave us safer working conditions. Their hard work helps deliver fair wages and better access to healthcare. But this isn't just an economic issue. It is also a question of civil rights. Society itself is freer when workers are empowered to band together and negotiate for better pay, benefits, and working conditions.

I might say, even in those States that are not right-to-work States, it is hard to organize, but when you impose a right-to-work law, then you have really stacked the odds in the ability of working men and women to organize themselves.

This is Black History Month, and I am reminded of these words from Dr. Martin Luther King: “In our glorious fight for civil rights, we must guard against being fooled by false slogans, such as ‘right-to-work.’ . . . Wherever these laws have been passed, wages are lower, job opportunities are fewer, and there are no civil rights. We do not intend to let them do this to us. We demand this fraud be stopped. Our weapon is our vote.”

Dr. King was right. Our weapon is our vote, and today, we are going to exercise that weapon and strike a blow for working men and women and for restoring the constitutional right of working men and women to organize freely and benefit this economy and benefit the quality of lives for people in communities all across this great land.

Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from California for giving me the time. I urge passage of the bill, and I support the rule underlying it.

□ 1315

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 16 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, one of the underlying bills here, H. Res. 826, is really nothing more than a political exercise, and I really am disappointed at how we have come to discuss the healthier adult opportunity demonstration, in the manner that it is.

If we were to have a legitimate debate on an optional policy, we should do so in a hearing in the committee of jurisdiction. That is why the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Republican leader WALDEN and me sent a letter to Chairman PALLONE to request such a hearing.

We should be asking questions of agencies and States that are deciding whether or not they would like to utilize this option to deploy the new section 1115 waiver for this very specific population.

Should a State choose to apply for this Healthy Adult Opportunity demonstration, it will only be allowed to address the adults that are under 65 that fall into the expansion population. This optional demonstration changes nothing for children. It changes nothing for seniors, changes nothing for individuals with disabilities. All essential health benefit requirements remain in place.

Most importantly, States do not have to take this option because it is an option. States can maintain the status quo and continue to operate their Medicaid programs as they were before this opportunity was presented to them. Some States may find this demonstration provides the necessary increased flexibility for them to handle the limited healthy adult population that is now covered under Medicaid expansion.

In fact, under one of the financing mechanisms, if a State does not spend all of its Federal allotment under the Healthy Adult Opportunity demonstration, it can keep 25 to 50 percent of the savings not to transfer over to the road and bridge fund, but to reinvest in Medicaid. In the States that might be ravished by an opioid epidemic, that could mean getting more individuals with opioid use disorder into treatment.

It could allow States additional flexibility to help their most vulnerable populations. And we heard very compelling testimony in the Rules Committee last night from the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS) about the unconscionably long waiting list for individuals with disabilities to get coverage under Medicaid.

Madam Speaker, 700,000 people across the country are on that waiting list. These shared savings could go in to reducing that case backlog for those individuals.

Look, this may not be an opportunity that every State wants to take. That is why it is optional. That is what optional means. My State, the State of Texas, is working through whether or not this would be beneficial, a beneficial demonstration opportunity for them. There is a lot to look at in the rule that was produced by the Department of Health and Human Services. After all, it was just a week ago that this was received, and people are looking into whether or not it makes sense for them.

But we, in this body, should take the time to understand this, rather than simply jump to a conclusion with an action that is ultimately going to be meaningless because it goes nowhere.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California's Eleventh District. I also thank, if I may, the persons who are associated with the Rules Committee who worked

tirelessly to get these bills to the floor. And I also thank the House leadership for allowing the bills to come to the floor.

Madam Speaker, I am honored today to say that I traveled to Puerto Rico after one of the hurricanes hit, Hurricane Maria. I was there with the Honorable BENNIE THOMPSON. This was a Homeland Security codel. And while I was there, I had the opportunity to meet with various and sundry NGOs, met with some of the emergency responders, the Corps of Engineers, the National Guard.

I had a firsthand opportunity to see the devastation that Puerto Rico suffered from. And this was prior to the 6.7 earthquake that hit on January 7.

Madam Speaker, I believe that it is time for us to act. I believe this legislation provides the means by which we can act appropriately and efficaciously. I believe that this bill, with what it contains from my bill, H.R. 3702, which was the CDBG-DR, disaster recovery bill, this legislation contains language from that, my bill, and I would like to just share some of the things that are important.

The bill includes the rigorous timelines for allocation action plan approval and grant agreement execution that was contained in the bill. It contains language that HUD will be required to allocate funds no later than 60 days after enactment of the supplemental. HUD would be required to review and approve or disapprove an action plan within 60 days of its submission to the Department, and HUD will be required to allocate funds no later than 60 days after the date of approval of a grantee's plan.

Madam Speaker, I think we have reached a point now where an emergency has become something that we must act upon immediately, if not sooner. The sooner would be today, but unfortunately, we will have the rule today. Immediately will be the vote tomorrow. I beg that all would support the bill.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Texas yielding to me.

I rise in opposition to this rule. And I have a whole stack of things that I will raise, but in the time that is available, I will say this: We watched as the Medicaid program was opened up more and more under President Obama. And when that happened, it caused a significant amount of turmoil in my State and many States across the country.

And so President Trump has stepped in and decided that he is going to offer an opportunity to have the equivalent of block grants going back to the States and let them make the decision, let them write the regulations because the States know best.

This great experiment in Federalism that we have, where the closer to the people that the decision can be made,

the more effective that decision is and the more effective the resources of our taxpayers are. That is the attempt and the endeavor on the part of President Trump, and I regret that so much politics have been churned into this, we have a hard time focusing on the policy.

When I see what happened at the prayer breakfast, and when I listened to the statement that has been made by the Speaker publicly in a conference a little earlier today, it spills forth upon this. Some of her words essentially show up in this document.

Madam Speaker, it is time for us to take a deep breath. Impeachment is over. Let's focus on policy.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise in support of the PRO Act. This much-needed legislation rebalances the economic playing field to give workers a fair shake, and it is long overdue.

Two nights ago, the President stood here and talked about how great the economy is doing, how the stock market is soaring, and unemployment is falling. But the truth on the ground is that people in the middle class and below are not being lifted by this tide. The cost of housing, childcare, education, and other basic essentials are rising at rates not matched by stagnant wages.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a report by the Foundation for Delaware County and Philadelphia Citizens For Children and Youth.

UNDERWATER: WHAT'S SINKING FAMILIES IN DELAWARE COUNTY

[From PCCY, Public Citizens for Children and Youth, Mar. 2019]

The American Dream is eroding in Delaware County. Incomes that used to provide a comfortable middle class life are no longer enough to even cover the basics. Four in ten families are likely to be underwater if they're raising children. Their financial outlook is bleak—a far cry from the prosperity that their parents enjoyed. And if things continue down this road, their children face a future of continued decline.

Hard-working families earning \$50,000, for instance, are likely to be more than \$3,000 in debt between child care, health care, housing, utilities, transportation, food, and taxes. And that's with the help of crucial child care and health insurance benefits. Even if these families have no child care needs, they will have less than \$7,000 left over after paying for the other essentials. That's under \$7,000 for things like clothes, sports teams, birthday presents, summer camps, class trips—just to name a few. Nearly a quarter of families earn this much or less in Delaware County.

Even families who are near the median income—an income that should solidify their middle class status—are drowning. Families making \$75,000 a year, for example, are likely to be saddled with over \$2,000 in debt after paying for the basics, since they do not receive subsidies for child care and health care. If these families are free from the burden of child care, they would have around

\$15,000 left after the major basic costs, but this is still hardly enough to cover the additional everyday costs for the children and parents. On top of that, these families have little money, if any, to save for things like retirement or college for their children, not to mention any emergency costs that may spring up. Nearly 40% of families in Delaware County make this much or less.

The parents in these struggling families bank on the hope that their children can move up the economic ladder, becoming more prosperous as adults than they, the parents, were. The surest way for children to achieve that upward mobility is to get a good education. Unfortunately, many Delaware County schools are in a similar boat as many families, struggling to find the resources to provide students with the skills they need to be upwardly mobile.

The mandated costs of pensions, special education and charter school payments are skyrocketing, growing by \$223 million in Delaware County school districts since 2010. Meanwhile State funding for these districts has grown by just \$107 million, forcing districts to make up the difference through local property tax increases. Even with these tax increases, most districts are unable to get more money in the classroom.

The funding challenges translate to academic struggle. The majority of students in the county—58%—fail the math PSSA, and 39% fail in reading. These figures are even worse in the districts with high shares of low income students, where 75% of students fail the math exam and 52% fail in reading.

The bleak situation facing Delaware County families will only change with large-scale action. History teaches us that bold policies can overcome massive problems facing society and lead to huge gains in the quality of life for all. As Nobel Prize-winning economist Paul Romer notes in discussing these types of policy changes, "[If we have a] sense of 'we've got to do the right thing' . . . everything can turn out better for everybody. But if you just are complacent, say 'it'll work itself out,' you are not going to be happy with the outcome." Delaware County families cannot afford complacency. The following policies must be implemented, or the cycle of financial stress will never end. The children in these struggling families will become the next generation of struggling families. The American Dream will become the American Drain.

To boost families' incomes:

Create a workforce development strategy to help people move into higher paying jobs.

Increase the State government's payments to agencies that employ low-wage, government-funded professionals, such as Direct Support Professionals and child care workers, so that wages are at least \$15 an hour and ideally \$18 an hour, to increase the ability of these professionals to stay above water while supporting a family.

To reduce the child care and early education cost burden:

Increase funding for Child Care Works, Pre-K Counts and Head Start.

Expand eligibility for Child Care Works.

Implement full day kindergarten in all school districts.

To reduce the health care cost burden:

Expand eligibility for free and subsidized Children's Health Insurance Program.

Preserve the Affordable Care Act.

To reduce the cost burden of other living expenses:

Create more affordable transportation through mobility planning at the County level.

Create affordable housing strategies at the County level.

To reduce the tax burden on financially struggling families:

Expand Pennsylvania's Tax Forgiveness program to incomes of at least \$75,000.

Offset property taxes by increasing State funding for public schools.

To improve the financial outlook of public schools:

Increase State K-12 basic education and special education funding.

Restore the State's charter school reimbursement to school districts.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, according to that report released in October, families in my district in Pennsylvania are being left underwater due to the high cost of living and debt they are forced to incur in order to make ends meet in this economy. A family making the median income of \$75,000 is likely to be \$2,000 under water at year's end.

The middle class is shrinking, and it is clear to see why. The economic divide in the United States has reached unprecedented levels, wealth is concentrated at the very top, and it is not trickling down. Workers have seen their rights stripped, their wages cut, and their dignity taken away.

Over the past three decades the average income for the bottom 90 percent of families, increased by 1.1 percent. During this same period, the average income for the wealthiest 1 percent nearly doubled.

Put simply, workers responsible for wealth creation in this country are not seeing their fair share. Over that same 30-year period, we have seen the percentage of American workers in unions steadily decline, not because people don't want to join unions and take part in the higher average salaries and better benefit structure they are likely to receive. No, it is a direct result of relentless coordinating and well-funded antiunion attacks from corporations and special interests.

Cynically misnamed right-to-work laws have harmed workers and their families. No one in this country is forced to join a union, but the fact is, states with higher numbers of union membership also have higher average salaries for all workers.

This bill would weaken antilabor State laws and close other loopholes that corporations use to exploit workers. The PRO Act will restore some fairness to the American economy and give workers a seat at the bargaining table they rightly deserve. It will introduce meaningful and forceable penalties for companies that violate workers' rights. No longer will companies be able to exploit employees' labor, betting that a toothless NLRB will only give them a slap on the wrist.

This bill would ensure that employees have the right to collectively bargain with companies that control the terms and conditions of their employment. One of the misleading arguments being made against this bill is that it will affect privacy. That is not true.

Madam Speaker, I proudly support this rule and the underlying bill, and I urge my colleagues to join me in support.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I just want to highlight a few things.

The gentleman from Virginia came and spoke about an amendment that will be offered if we defeat the previous question.

As a consequence of that defeat of the previous question is the consideration of the amendment offered by Mr. RIGGLEMAN. And some of the things that people need to understand is that, well, they will be voting against these things if they vote to approve the previous question:

The acknowledgment that jobs and investment are coming into this country at a rate that has previously not been known. America is now energy-independent and energy jobs, like so many elements of our country, are at a record high.

We are building an inclusive society that is making sure that every young American gets a great education and the opportunity to achieve the American Dream. That Congress wants to support our students and back the plan to offer vocational and technical education to every single high school in America.

In addition, the commitment to access to high speed internet, including rural America, and the defense of religious liberty.

Many of us worked the prayer breakfast this morning and heard this an additional time, but including the constitutional right to pray in public schools. I just want people to be aware that if they defeat the previous question, this is where we will be engaging.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, as usual, Trump says one thing here and does another. He continues his assault on healthcare—no protection for pre-existing conditions, nothing done to lower prescription price-gouging, and even considering potential cuts to what they call "entitlements" and we call Medicare.

Trump supports only junk insurance and junk ideas, like this crazy idea to block-grant Medicaid, which is a truly block-headed approach that will jeopardize insurance coverage for 1 in 5 Americans.

In Texas, Medicaid is a safety net with more holes than net through which many needy Texans regularly fall. Much of the available assistance is critical to our seniors. Already slashed to the bone, Texas Medicaid does not have any more room for the kind of cuts that Trump is urging. Hospitals are struggling to stay afloat in many parts of the State. Healthcare providers, some of them go out of business. And to the disgrace of the Lone Star State, we have almost 1 million children, more than in any other State in the Union, who lack any insurance access.

Indeed, it is the Affordable Care Act that actually slowed Medicaid spend-

ing, but Republicans will have none of that. This landmark legislation tried to patch the holes in the safety net, but even when Texas was offered 100 cents on the dollar from the Federal Government to extend Medicaid to some of its citizens, Texas refused to do that, and has continued to do so.

Now this Trump block-headed approach would widen the coverage gap for 5 million people with disabilities and millions of children who suffer when their parents cannot get care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield another 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. One of the advantages of the Medicaid program is if more people require coverage during an economic downturn, or if costs go up because of a public health emergency, like coronavirus or an opioid epidemic, the Federal funding automatically increases. If you have a stingy State Republican government that caps it, that coverage will go down instead of up. What is out of control in America today is not Medicaid spending, but this unhinged President's attempts to undermine healthcare access for as many Americans as he can do.

Madam Speaker, let's oppose it.

□ 1330

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I have stated many times over, the rule proposed by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services is an option for States. It does in no way affect or impact the mandatory safety net populations that are required to be covered under Medicaid.

The population that was included in Medicaid expansion, in States that underwent expansion, this is where the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services would provide those State Governors, those State legislatures, an option to consider a block grant if they desired. It is also written in the proposed rule that they could opt for a per-beneficiary allotment, which might even impart additional flexibility.

But one of the provisions of the rule, as has been proposed, is that, if there is a significant change—the State undergoes a natural disaster or emergency—the block grant number can be adjusted. It is not something that is immobile.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I have no more speakers. So, if the gentleman from Texas would like to close, I am prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I do want to share and introduce into the RECORD an article published by the Brookings Institution—Brookings, of all places—published in September of 2018 that analyzes global poverty levels, finding that

over 50 percent of the world's population can now be considered middle class or above. That means, for the first time, a majority of the world's population is above the poverty line.

According to this article from Brookings, worldwide, one person escapes extreme poverty every second, and five people are entering the middle class per second.

In the United States, the strength of our economy is partly based on pro-growth and pro-business policies, including those policies included in the 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

Madam Speaker, I include the Brookings article in the RECORD.

[From Brookings, Sept. 27, 2018]

A GLOBAL TIPPING POINT: HALF THE WORLD IS NOW MIDDLE CLASS OR WEALTHIER

(By Homi Kharas and Kristofer Hamel)

Something of enormous global significance is happening almost without notice. For the first time since agriculture-based civilization began 10,000 years ago, the majority of humankind is no longer poor or vulnerable to falling into poverty. By our calculations, as of this month, just over 50 percent of the world's population, or some 3.8 billion people, live in households with enough discretionary expenditure to be considered "middle class" or "rich." About the same number of people are living in households that are poor or vulnerable to poverty. So September 2018 marks a global tipping point. After this, for the first time ever, the poor and vulnerable will no longer be a majority in the world. Barring some unfortunate global economic setback, this marks the start of a new era of a middle-class majority.

We make these claims based on a classification of households into those in extreme poverty (households spending below \$1.90 per person per day) and those in the middle class (households spending \$11–110 per day per person in 2011 purchasing power parity, or PPP). Two other groups round out our classification: vulnerable households fall between those in poverty and the middle class; and those who are at the top of the distribution who are classified as "rich."

Our "middle class" classification was first developed in 2010 and has been used by many researchers. While acknowledging that the middle class does not have a precise definition that can be globally applied, the threshold we use in this work has the following characteristics: those in the middle class have some discretionary income that can be used to buy consumer durables like motorcycles, refrigerators, or washing machines. They can afford to go to movies or indulge in other forms of entertainment. They may take vacations. And they are reasonably confident that they and their family can weather an economic shock—like illness or a spell of unemployment—without falling back into extreme poverty.

By classifying all households in the world into one of these four groups, using income and expenditure surveys from 188 countries, we are able to derive measures of the global distribution of income. Our social enterprise World Data Lab—the maker of World Poverty Clock—has refined these estimates and created a new interactive data model to estimate all income brackets for almost every country for every point in time until 2030 by combining demographic and economic data.

A lot has been written about the world's progress in reducing the number of people living in extreme poverty, as highlighted in the recent Goalkeepers report put out by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. We believe that another story relates to the rapid

emergence of the global middle class. This middle class story is probably bigger in terms of the number of people affected. In the world today, about one person escapes extreme poverty every second; but five people a second are entering the middle class. The rich are growing too, but at a far smaller rate (1 person every 2 seconds).

Why does it matter that a middle-class tipping point has been reached and that the middle class is the most rapidly growing segment of the global income distribution? Because the middle class drive demand in the global economy and because the middle class are far more demanding of their governments.

Consider the structure of global economic demand. Private household consumption accounts for about half of global demand (the other half is evenly split between investment and government consumption). Two-thirds of household consumption comes from the middle class. The rich spend more per person, but are too few in number to drive the global economy. The poor and vulnerable are numerous, but have too little income to spend. For most businesses, the sweet spot to target is the middle class. This has long been true in individual advanced economies; it is now true on a global scale.

Targeting the global middle class is not easy. The middle class like differentiated products, and their tastes will vary from country to country. The new middle class is predominantly Asian—almost nine in 10 of the next billion middle-class consumers will be Asian—but they are spread out in China, India, and South and South East Asia. It's no accident that the latest Hollywood hit is *Crazy Rich Asians* or that Asian multinationals are emerging that have built a domestic brand and now look to compete abroad.

The middle class is already the largest segment of demand in the global economy. What makes it interesting for business is that it is also the most rapidly growing segment, projected to reach some 4 billion people by end 2020 and 5.3 billion people by 2030. Compared to today, the middle class in 2030 will have 1.7 billion more people, while the vulnerable group will have 900 million fewer people. Trends for the poor and the rich and more modest, at –150 million people and +100 million, respectively.

By our calculations, the middle-class markets in China and India in 2030 will account for \$14.1 trillion and \$12.3 trillion, respectively, comparable in size to a U.S. middle-class market at that time of \$15.9 trillion.

In most countries, there is a clear relationship between the fate of the middle class and the happiness of the population. According to the Gallup World Poll, new entrants into the middle class are noticeably happier than those stuck in poverty or in vulnerable households. Conversely, individuals in countries where the middle class is shrinking report greater degrees of personal stress. The middle class also puts pressure on governments to perform better. They look to their governments to provide affordable housing, education, and universal health care. They rely on public safety nets to help them in sickness, unemployment or old age. But they resist efforts of governments to impose taxes to pay the bills. This complicates the politics of middle-class societies, so they range from autocratic to liberal democracies. Many advanced and middle-income countries today are struggling to find a set of politics that can satisfy a broad middle-class majority.

The tipping point in the world today offers opportunities for business but complications for policymakers.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, labor unions were initially created to

ensure fair wages and fair working conditions for employees. Today, Americans are more prosperous than ever.

While I support the freedom of an individual to join a labor union, the necessity that required labor unions is waning as wages increase and, subsequently, union membership decreases.

Why would we now pass a bill that is diametrically in opposition to the benefits that have been enjoyed by this country?

And, again, I would like to emphasize that State participation in the Healthy Adult Opportunity demonstration is optional. If this demonstration project does not fit the needs or the goals of a State Medicaid program, they do not have to participate.

As the Republican leader of the Energy and Commerce Health Subcommittee, I believe conversations like this are best to occur at the committee level first, where Members can call witnesses and have a serious discussion.

Do you know what? Regular order can be your friend. It doesn't appear that Democrats are taking this seriously.

Finally, Republicans remain committed to helping all Americans in need, including those in Puerto Rico, but a thorough evaluation of best and most accountable allocation of resources is needed. We support our fellow Americans in Puerto Rico and will continue to find ways to ensure their recovery.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, "no" on the rule, "no" on the underlying measures, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I just want to thank everyone who came down and spoke on this important issue. In my view, there is nothing more important.

You don't have to read the 600 pages in Thomas Piketty to know that the level of inequality in this country right now. And I acknowledge some of the improvements that globalism has given to people who earn \$1 a day and are now up to the astronomical level of \$2 a day, but that has not benefited the American worker.

As I said in my opening comments, 40 percent of American households live on \$30,000 a year. That is not helping everybody. Most of the benefits of the last 50 years went to the top 1 percent, people, as I said before, who earn—not own, earn—\$7 million a year as opposed to the 99 percent below them who earn \$54,000 a year.

We have to fix this. This is not democracy, as Brandeis and Lincoln said. As Eisenhower said, when the economy was growing at historic records, as I mentioned in my opening statements.

And this is how times have changed, particularly as a former Republican, former small business owner, former teamster, and former hotel and restaurant union member. Those jobs, that protection, gave me the money to

save enough money to go into business for myself and treat my employees as I would want to be treated, which helped my customers.

Eisenhower said:

Only a handful of reactionaries harbor the ugly thought of breaking unions and depriving working men and women of the right to join the union of their choice.

President Eisenhower said:

I have no use for those, regardless of their political party, who hold some vain and foolish dream of spinning the clock back to days when organized labor was a huddled, almost helpless mass.

Eisenhower said:

Only a fool would try to deprive working men and women of the right to join the union of their choice.

Lincoln said:

All that harms labor is treason to America.

Madam Speaker, for decades, tax breaks, rollbacks on regulations that benefited the ultrawealthy and powerful corporations, unfair labor laws and the enactment and enforcement of those laws, and the rise of monopolies have fueled inequality to the point where we are at Great Depression levels, and we will suffer the consequences if we don't address that in this room. It will be addressed outside of this room.

We have an opportunity today to move this country in the right direction with these three measures. I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the previous question.

And I have two last quotes. Plutarch said, 2,000 years ago, that the oldest and fatal flaw to republics has always been the imbalance between the rich and the poor.

Samuel Gompers, great union leader, when he was fighting to organize Americans during the Depression, said: Unions and equality, and until we get it, no surrender.

The text of the material previously referred to by Mr. BURGESS is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 833

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 834) supporting policies that are a part of the "Best is Yet to Come" blueprint, outlined by President Trump during his historic, optimistic State of the Union Address. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority and Minority Leaders or their designees. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 834.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I rise to offer a question of the privileges of the House previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE). The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 832

Whereas, on December 20, 2019, Speaker Pelosi extended an invitation for President Trump to address a joint session of Congress on February 4, 2020;

Whereas, on February 4, 2020, President Trump delivered his State of the Union address, in which he honored the sacrifice of the following American heroes and their families:

General Charles McGee, one of the last surviving Tuskegee Airmen, who served in World War II, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War;

Kayla Mueller, a humanitarian aid worker who was caring for suffering civilians in Syria when she was kidnapped, tortured and enslaved by ISIS for over 500 days before being murdered by ISIS leader Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi;

Army Staff Sergeant Christopher Hake, who was killed while serving his second tour of duty in Iraq by a roadside bomb supplied by Iranian terrorist leader Qasem Soleimani;

Sergeant First Class Townsend Williams, who is currently serving his fourth deployment in the Middle East and his wife Amy, who works full time for the Army and devotes hundreds of hours helping military families;

Whereas immediately following the address, while still presiding over the joint session, Speaker Pelosi ripped up an official copy of the President's remarks, which contained the names and stories of these patriots who sacrificed so much for our country; and

Whereas the conduct of Speaker Pelosi was a breach of decorum and degraded the proceedings of the joint session, to the discredit of the House: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives disapproves of the behavior of Speaker Pelosi during the joint session of Congress held on February 4, 2020.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOYER moves that the resolution be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to lay the resolution on the table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 833; and

Adoption of House Resolution 833, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 193, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

YEAS—224

Adams	Carbajal	Cox (CA)
Aguilar	Cárdenas	Craig
Allred	Carson (IN)	Crist
Amash	Cartwright	Crow
Axne	Case	Cuellar
Barragán	Casten (IL)	Cunningham
Bass	Castor (FL)	Davids (KS)
Beatty	Castro (TX)	Davis (CA)
Bera	Chu, Judy	Davis, Danny K.
Beyer	Cicilline	Dean
Bishop (GA)	Cisneros	DeFazio
Blumenauer	Clark (MA)	DeGette
Blunt Rochester	Clarke (NY)	DeLauro
Bonamici	Clay	DelBene
Boyle, Brendan F.	Clyburn	Delgado
Brindisi	Cohen	Demings
Brown (MD)	Connolly	DeSaulnier
Brownley (CA)	Cooper	Deutch
Bustos	Correa	Dingell
Butterfield	Costa	Doggett
	Courtney	

Doyle, Michael F.	Levin (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Engel	Levin (MI)	Ruiz
Escobar	Lieu, Ted	Ruppersberger
Eshoo	Lipinski	Rush
Españillat	Loebach	Ryan
Evans	Lofgren	Sánchez
Finkenauer	Lowenthal	Sarbanes
Fletcher	Lowey	Scanlon
Frankel	Lujan	Schakowsky
Fudge	Luria	Schiff
Gallego	Lynch	Schneider
Garamendi	Malinowski	Schrader
Garcia (IL)	Maloney	Schrier
Garcia (TX)	Carolyn B.	Scott (VA)
Golden	Maloney, Sean	Scott, David
Gomez	Matsui	Serrano
Gonzalez (TX)	McAdams	Shalala
Gottheimer	McBath	Sherman
Green, Al (TX)	McCollum	Sherrill
Grijalva	McEachin	Sires
Haaland	McGovern	Slotkin
Harder (CA)	McNerney	Smith (WA)
Hastings	Meeks	Soto
Hayes	Meng	Spanberger
Heck	Moore	Speier
Higgins (NY)	Moulton	Stanton
Himes	Mucarsel-Powell	Stevens
Horn, Kendra S.	Murphy (FL)	Suozi
Horsford	Nadler	Swalwell (CA)
Houlahan	Napolitano	Takano
Hoyer	Neal	Thompson (CA)
Huffman	Neguse	Thompson (MS)
Jackson Lee	Norcross	Titus
Jayapal	O'Halleran	Tlaib
Jeffries	Ocasio-Cortez	Tonko
Johnson (GA)	Omar	Torres (CA)
Johnson (TX)	Pallone	Torres Small (NM)
Kaptur	Panetta	Trahan
Keating	Pappas	Trone
Kelly (IL)	Pascrell	Underwood
Kennedy	Payne	Vargas
Khanna	Perlmutter	Veasey
Kildee	Peters	Vela
Kilmer	Peterson	Velázquez
Kim	Phillips	Visclosky
Kind	Pingree	Wasserman
Krishnamoorthi	Pocan	Schultz
Kuster (NH)	Porter	Waters
Lamb	Pressley	Watson Coleman
Langevin	Price (NC)	Welch
Larsen (WA)	Quigley	Wexton
Larson (CT)	Raskin	Wild
Lawrence	Rice (NY)	Wilson (FL)
Lawson (FL)	Richmond	Yarmuth
Lee (NV)	Rose (NY)	
	Rouda	

NAYS—193

Abraham	Duncan	Keller
Aderholt	Dunn	Kelly (MS)
Allen	Emmer	Kelly (PA)
Amodei	Estes	King (IA)
Armstrong	Ferguson	King (NY)
Arrington	Fitzpatrick	Kinziger
Babin	Fleischmann	Kustoff (TN)
Bacon	Flores	LaHood
Baird	Fortenberry	LaMalfa
Balderson	Fox (NC)	Lamborn
Banks	Fulcher	Latta
Barr	Gallagher	Lesko
Bergman	Gianforte	Long
Biggs	Gibbs	Loudermilk
Billirakis	Gohmert	Lucas
Bishop (NC)	Gonzalez (OH)	Luetkemeyer
Bishop (UT)	Gooden	Marchant
Bost	Gosar	Marshall
Brady	Granger	Massie
Brooks (AL)	Graves (GA)	Mast
Brooks (IN)	Graves (LA)	McCarthy
Buchanan	Graves (MO)	McCauley
Buck	Green (TN)	McClintock
Bucshon	Griffith	McHenry
Budd	Grothman	McKinley
Burchett	Guest	Meadows
Burgess	Guthrie	Meuser
Byrne	Hagedorn	Miller
Calvert	Harris	Mitchell
Carter (GA)	Hartzer	Moolenaar
Carter (TX)	Hern, Kevin	Mooney (WV)
Chabot	Herrera Beutler	Mullin
Cheney	Hice (GA)	Murphy (NC)
Cline	Higgins (LA)	Newhouse
Cloud	Hill (AR)	Norman
Cole	Holding	Nunes
Collins (GA)	Hollingsworth	Olson
Comer	Hudson	Palazzo
Conaway	Huizenga	Palmer
Cook	Hurd (TX)	Pence
Crawford	Johnson (LA)	Perry
Crenshaw	Johnson (OH)	Posey
Curtis	Johnson (SD)	Ratcliffe
Davidson (OH)	Jordan	Reed
Davis, Rodney	Joyce (OH)	Reschenthaler
DesJarlais	Joyce (PA)	Rice (SC)
Diaz-Balart	Katko	Riggleman